

USDA Planning Meeting (3 - 4 Feb 2004)

Introductions by Ron

NRCS talked about a May meeting in Denver on NAIP/NAPP. Quick discussion about purchasing commercial imagery for leaf-off season.

Glenn Bethel's briefing -- talked about USDA requirements and how other departments need these requirements ASAP. Walked thru the draft spreadsheet for the data call scheduled for later this month. Not all columns in the spreadsheet need to be filled out.

<http://svs.gsfc.nasa.gov/search/AnimationSeries/GreatZooms.html>

Geoff's briefing -- overview of FY03 activities. The total 1m price for NAIP (\$12/sq mile) with deliveries is approximately the same cost as just NAPP acquisition. Quick discussion on the 2m digital results from IA and the cause of the poor quality. NRCS asked if the APFO website (apfo.usda.gov) can include the ortho status of NAIP (i.e., the current status of NAIP between acquisition and final acceptance). Glenn stated that some of the NAIP contractors are asking for an earlier progress payment than the 60% given after acquisition.

George Rohaley's briefing -- talked about NRI and NRCS's cost sharing for DOQs in 2003. He discussed the possibility of using high-resolution satellite systems for acquiring AK requirements. NRCS may have \$3M for NAIP in FY04 (priority states are IL, OH, KY, ID, and MI).

Dorsey Plunk -- covered DeLorme's software XMap Photoflight used for flight planning. Then he discussed FY03 NRI results and FY04 NRI planning. Summarized the benefit of combining the ERDAS buy, it reduced the cost by 50%.

Jim Ware passed out handouts on soil survey (additional copies are available on the web).

Wynn's briefing -- provided an overview on the APFO FY03 inspection status. Several questions on what has been accepted and when the full-resolution tiles be released. NRCS asked if it is possible to get an "ok to release" letter from APFO when the CCMs have been inspected and approved for public release. (AI) Action item for APFO is to cc copies to NRCS (Later discussion determined cc copies not necessary if information is available on the APFO website). The group had a detail discussion on the distribution of the interim CCM and how IN got a copy of it on their website. NRCS released it after creating a projection file and metadata.

Lori's briefing -- give a quick overview the new APFO website scheduled to be updated in the near future.

Bob's briefing – provided an image quality briefing and new NAIP film specification. Bob showed side-by-side comparison of 1st generation (digital capture), 2nd generation (IR positive film), and 3rd generation (B&W NDOP negative film). Glenn asked what states might be good candidates for IR, Bob thinks in the southeast such as North and South Carolinas.

Kent and Kevin briefed the Geospatial Data Warehouse. Kevin gave two good examples of using the GDW online (thick client using ArcMap and a thin client using a web browser).

FS gave a quick overview of FS efforts at the national level. All funds are at the region level, however they are requesting \$1.6M/year in FY05 which would give them a 5 year cycle. All of the FS Regions updated the group the status of their aerial photography. Region 1 reported that someone acquired imagery right after the CA fires. No one knows who funded it but Region 1 will investigate. Region 8 has a issue with the southern portion of Cherokee NF flown under contract similar to NAIP. Bob is looking into what may have caused the problem.

Tony Kimmet's briefing - NRCS would like to collect LIDAR (10m DEMs) while flying in NAIP 04. A question on 10m DEM cost was asked and Tony estimated \$300-500 (or less) per DOQQ. Geoff stated that APFO could add an option to the NAIP contract for the LIDAR deliverable, but he needs requirements now for the RFP. However, having a 10m DEMs may cause confusion or conflict with the 3m accuracy requirement currently being used on NAIP. GSTC is working on a project that we may be able to piggyback on to do some evaluations on different accuracies. Someone stated that we need to define the horiz accuracy first and that will drive the vertical accuracy in the DEM. NRCS is also interested in testing the ADS40s added stereo imagery collection. Northwest Group estimated that this stereo collection would add approximately 10% to the cost. However, this may have contractual problems for NAIP 04 because film and digital will be competed directly against each other. NRCS would prefer that APFO delivers data on firewire hard drives. For technical reasons, APFO will probably require tapes for the vendors. Tony gave a quick discussion on JPEG2000.

John's briefing on the NAIP03 lessons learned. Question was asked on how APFO was going to define the radiometric balancing on the 04 contract. (AI) Glenn suggested APFO submit a "problem statement" that will be presented to the research community to see if they could help define radiometric balancing/histogram specifications. George asked that at least 3 maps on the web, what was flown (flown/received), tiles delivered (received/accepted), and CCMs delivered (received/accepted).

There was an online discussion on what to charge the farmers for the CCM CDs.

Geoff moved on to defining the 1m vs 2m requirements, NRCS priorities are OH, KY, IL, ID, and MI. Texas wants 1m (maybe IR), PA wants 1m IR, and Utah may get the funds for 1m. The five NRCS states and the 2 or 3 state partners would hit the internal APFO limit. A long discussion on acquiring more 1m states if the user would accept long inspection times (up to 12 months).

APFO will create a new coverage map that will show the NAIP04 minimum requirements. The FS asked for shape files instead of a pdf file.

Harry Slawter's overview of the wetlands pilot program using NRI imagery. The high resolution NRI images proved successful for baseline but NAIP was good enough for annual review. His position is to recommend partnering with NAIP (1m) rather than add additional NRI images (except for special cases).

Old action items: Mark gave Bob Rosenthal's briefing on moving away from mylar indexes to a digital product. Mylar is no longer in production and APFO will not be providing mylar index in FY04 and later. The FS regions will need to submit a GeoTiff or shape file along with their requests.

The group determined that future USDA Planning Meetings will be held at APFO in the early December timeframe.

ACTION ITEMS

- a) Attend Remote Sensing Conference the week of Apr 7th (APFO). Bill will try to get NAIP on the agenda.
- b) Provide some marketing material to Glenn for use on educating the public and other government agencies on USDA's geospatial programs (?).
- c) Provide a "top ten" NAIP states (1m) requirement to APFO that want to fund (NRCS).
- d) Develop a planning map for NAIP04, detailed to the DOQQ (APFO).
- e) Provide 3 maps on the APFO NAIP website that shows what was flown (flown/received), what tiles have been delivered (received/accepted), and CCMs have been delivered (received/accepted) (APFO).
- f) Include the NRCS's Alaska requirement in the NAIP04 contract, using the standard NAIP specifications (APFO).
- g) Investigate getting a "no cost" sample of NAIP03 IR imagery from Northwest Group (APFO).
- h) Forward information on NAIP04 to all FS regions (Bill).
- i) Write an updated NAIP standard (APFO).